



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

degenerating into a dot on the line with a disconnected curve lying on its back above. This *e* is found more carefully written in Young's letter to Mrs. Howard in Add. MS. 22626, f. 117 (*cir.* 1734), and in a very similar degenerate form in the letter to the Duke of Newcastle in Add. 32881, f. 293 (1758) and those to George Keate in Add. 30992, ff. 1, 2, (1760). Another point is the spelling of Monday as "Moonday" which occurs also in the letter to Mrs. Howard. If the letter is accepted as autograph, the date "Ap. 9. 1751," being clearly in the hand of the body of the letter, must be the correct one and the passage at the end beginning: "wh is ye most respectable being" must be the original conclusion. The character of the hand strongly favours the earlier date, for in 1758 Young was already ill and his hand had begun to shake, as appears from the letter to Newcastle. In 1760 his eyes were failing and the hand had still further degenerated. After 1761, on the evidence of the George Keate volume, his housekeeper, Mrs. Hallows, served as amanuensis. . . . It is to be noted that Young had the habit of dating his letters in the bottom left-hand corner."

The Forster Collection of Richardson's correspondence in the Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington, does not contain any letters from Edward Young, the librarian states. Search of this correspondence for the years 1751-58 by a member of the library staff revealed no reference to the letter in the Wellesley collection.

This one instance of the telescoping of two letters in date seven years apart suggests a more general inaccuracy in Mrs. Barbauld's editing, and makes more than ever desirable a fresh study of the Richardson correspondence in the Forster Collection.

HELEN SARD HUGHES.

Wellesley College.

BRIEF MENTION

Milton's Prosody, with a chapter on Accentual Verse and Notes, by Robert Bridges. Revised final edition (Oxford University Press, 1921. viii + 119 pp.). In a playful preface Mr. Bridges expresses the wish that the book could itself utter a vituperative prelude against its creator, for that would be welcome because of his "sense of justice and sport" and because it would "supply that first utility of a preface, which is to spare critics the labour of examining the book." This fancy would be disturbed by being linked with the serious history of the book. That recital is therefore banished to a place "among the notes at the end." The "Note A to the preface" (pp. 113-114), concerning matters now declared "not fit for a preface" will therefore be accepted as representing a pardonable inconsistency with the writer's judgment of the appropriate purport of a preface shown in the edition of 1901.

As much of the history of the book as is now set down has points of special interest. That the author began to write on

Milton's versification thirty-three years ago, and that he has now welcomed the invitation of his publishers to "finally rehandle" the subject, because he has come "to learn more about the subject than I understood when I began with it,"—these are statements that put a stress both upon the virtue of a sustained purpose and upon the subject of versification as one that requires diligent study rather than hasty and subjective guess-work. Mr. Bridges frankly acknowledges that in its previous forms his treatise has been to him "a perennial discomfort." At one time it induced "some young poets" to adopt "Miltonic inversions so freely into their blank verse that champions of the prevailing orthodoxy raised an indignant protest in the newspapers, wherein the discussion grew so incredibly hot that a London evening journal advertised 'prosody' as an attractive item in its daily posters."

Altho the book now before us has been newly composed, it will not be found that Mr. Bridges has altogether changed his method of scansion. He still holds, for example, that there are "lines with only four accents" (p. 38):

As from the Center thrice to th' utmost Pole. i, 74.

And in luxurious Cities where the noyse. i, 498.

The italics mark "the unaccented or weak 'feet.'" This fundamental error is mitigated by the assumption that in reading "a slight accent will be given" to the initial words of the quoted lines, "so that the foot is really inverted." But this does not create a presumption, as it might, against the further teaching that the stress may fail in the second, third, fourth, and even in the fifth place. It fails in the second place in "*Serv'd only* to discover sights of woe"; in the fifth place, in "*No light, but rather darkness visible,*" where again, it is assumed, that the inherent rhythmic value of the last syllable of a line may enable a weak syllable to "hold its own in this tenth place, and the last essential accent of the verse may be that of the 'fourth foot.'" This reasoning is carried still further to justify the statement that "some lines have only three full stresses." One of the given examples is this, "*Transfix us to the bottom of this Gulfe*"; and the conclusion is reached "that there is no one place in the verse where an accent is indispensable." Conversely, no line can have more than five stresses, for in the unusual line, "*Rocks, cáves, lakes, féns, bogs, déns, and shádes of déath,*" "the accented syllables will, by the enforcing of voice-tone, be able to subordinate" rhythmically the heavy words in the theses. This is correct, but it should suggest that the rhythm will also evoke the stress on syllables that in prose are usually light, for rhythm plays the pipe to which the word-accents, whether they be heavy or light, must dance.

It is to be regretted that in assuming "variety in number of stresses," Mr. Bridges has again indorsed errors that pervert

fundamental principles of English versification. A poet need not be reminded that rhythmic regularity in the succession of stresses does not require the stresses to be of equal 'weight'; that the line-melody is diversified by the variations in the weight of the regularly disposed stresses. And surely in the practice of versification no one can escape the conviction that there is a verse-rhetoric that induces minutely effective accuracy in the employment of minor words and of formative syllables that express conceptual relations and modifications of the thought. There is therefore a permissible stressing of prepositions and conjunctions as well as of formative syllables, such as *-ble*, *-er*, *-est*, *-ly*, *-ness*, *-y*, etc. and *dis-*, *mis-*, *pro-*, *pre-*, *trans-*, *un-*, etc.,—a stressing that is governed by the principle of appropriate and effective expression of subordinate concepts and relations. Mr. Bridges is in serious error, therefore, when he declares that it would make many of Milton's lines ridiculous to stress the conjunction *and*, which the poet has often placed in "stress-places" (p. 39). He may also permit one to ask him to suppress preconceptions that he may test his response to the following scansion of lines he has cited:

And in luxúrious cíties whére the nóyse.
 Serv'd ónly tó discóver sights of wóe.
 No líght, but ráther dárkness vísíblé.
 His Mínistérs of véngeance ánd pursúit.
 Transfíx us tó the bóttóm óf this gúlfe.

Mr. Bridges may say that this it is just that "prevailing orthodoxy" which he is laboring to correct. But will the rejoinder not be affected by an untrammelled consideration of the conceptual principles reflected in that orthodoxy,—principles that are so easily verified in the exigencies of special emphasis in prose? These special effects in prose clearly indicate the sustained exigencies under which the language is employed in versification; the finer and varied shades of emphasis thus come to mark off the art of poetry from the art of prose.

Mr. Bridges has, therefore, announced and defended a doctrine of rhythm that, in the judgment of the writer of this notice, is so fundamentally untenable as to affect the validity of his treatise. He has prepared his readers for statements that would otherwise cause bewilderment. Thus, for example: "A consistent prosody is, however, so insignificant a part in what makes good English poetry, that I find that I do not myself care very much whether some good poetry be consistent in its versification or not: indeed I think I have liked some verses better because they do not scan, and thus displease pedants" (p. 99). But that view; he adds, must of course not interfere with one when "considering [pedantically] prosody and the principles of rhythm." In this connection one is reminded of Mr. Verity's amazing words: "No one,

of course, should presume to tie Milton down to rigid principles of prosody, and scan his lines as though they were a schoolboy's copy of much-toiled iambics. A poet like Milton makes his own laws, and it is our business to find out what those laws are, ere we criticise" (*Samson Agonistes*, 1892, xxxvii f.).

Another, indeed the principal, argument against unwavering 'regularity' of rhythm is developed by 'inverting the feet.' Here one encounters one of those persistent errors which have the peculiar force of holding and attracting adherents disposed to favor an attitude of mind in vaunted superiority to the guidance of sound and simple instruction. Mr. Bridges continues to teach 'inversion,' but because of the lack of stress-marks thruout portions of his treatise the limits of his doctrine are not clear. One is left to make inferences from his selected examples.

As to the inversion of the first foot, Mr. Bridges correctly accepts its historic validity (p. 42), and also rightly observes that this inversion does not "disturb the rhythm." Inversions within the line are acknowledged to disturb the rhythm, but this is in conformity with the assumption that "the accent may be shifted on to the odd syllable in any place in the line." This serves "to call attention to the word which carries the irregular accent or stress." These inversions "are, therefore, used primarily in relation to the sense." The rhetoric of prose is thus allowed to displace the more subtle rhetoric of verse. This sustains the artistically harmful school-dictum, once so insistently taught, that poetry should be read as one would read prose. Mr. Bridges is not, it will be agreed, misrepresented in that inference, for he declares that all inversions and variations of rhythm "owe their value to the presupposed metrical type from which they vary; but they must not be disguised by reading a conventional stress in the regular place. They determine the rhythm [this is not clear], nor is the metre falsified by them, because the interruption is not long enough, and the majority of verses sustain the impression of the typical form" (p. 42). But no unbiassed reader can fail to observe that the "impression of the typical form" is 'sustained' in the "majority of verses" by stresses belonging to those accentual (or grammatical) and conceptual categories which Mr. Bridges pronounces inadmissible. This would be observed if all the stresses were marked in the lines selected to show inversion. Thus, in "Me, me only, just object of His ire," the stress on *ónely* is marked to show inversion of the second foot; but what of the remaining stresses, especially that of the preposition *of*? And surely the line cited from Keats is to be scanned thus:

Bright stár, would Í were stéadfast ás thou árt

But here Mr. Bridges finds an inverted fifth foot. The true scan-
sion of this line legitimates those categories of stress which thru

the centuries have been employed by the poets, and which establish, therefore, those permanent principles and conventionalities of English rhythm (of iambic and trochaic movement) which, regrettably, Mr. Bridges has now in his *novissima verba* not dealt with in a satisfactory manner.

J. W. B.

Fleurs de France, Poésies lyriques depuis le Romantisme. Avec introduction de W. P. Ker, professeur de poésie à Oxford, et préface de Lady Frazer (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1921. xvi + 160 pp.). Cette petite anthologie dont l'auteur n'est pas nommé rendra de réels services au public et aux élèves de langue anglaise. Selon la formule connue, elle peut être mise entre toutes les mains. La division bien qu'arbitraire est en somme acceptable: les derniers Romantiques, les Parnassiens, les Symbolistes, les modernes. Dans le détail cependant, on éprouve quelque étonnement à voir classer Ephraïm Mikhaël, Hélène Vacaresco et Rostand parmi les Parnassiens; en plus d'un cas la distinction entre les Symbolistes et les modernes pourrait également se discuter. Le choix témoigne d'un goût très sûr et d'une connaissance exacte du mouvement poétique des cinquante dernières années. On doit remercier le compilateur anonyme d'avoir attiré l'attention sur plusieurs poètes trop peu connus du public étranger. Mais pourquoi, puisque parmi les femmes on citait Hélène Vacaresco et la comtesse de Noailles, n'avoir pas donné au moins un poème d'Hélène Picard?

G. C.

Index Verborum de Covarruvias Orozco: Tesoro de la Lengua Castellana o Española, Madrid, 1674-1673. By John M. Hill. (*Indiana University Studies*, Vol. VIII, Study No. 48, March, 1921. Pp. iv, 186.) Professor John M. Hill has done a real service to Hispanic studies by preparing an alphabetical list of all the words that are explained in the dictionary of Covarruvias, with definite directions as to where each word can be found. Those having to do with the literature of the Spanish *Siglo de Oro* know that the dictionary of Covarruvias is invaluable, but they have learned from bitter experience that it is often difficult to find the desired word. It may be there, but be quite out of its proper place. With the aid of Professor Hill's index one may ascertain at a glance whether the word is to be found in the dictionary, and if it is there, one knows how to turn to it quickly.

There are two editions of the dictionary of Covarruvias, that of 1611, and that of 1674 with additional material added by Remigio. Professor Hill chose the second edition as the more complete; moreover, that roughly coincides in date with the close of the Golden Age of Spanish literature.

E. C. H.